

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the present application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,631,122 B1 (Arunachalam) and objected to Claims 5-10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 11-18 have been allowed.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under §102(e), the Examiner states that Arunachalam anticipates the claim. Claim 1 has been amended and is now further distinguished. Arunachalam discloses a wireless quality of service (QoS) agent for an all-Internet Protocol (IP) network in which the QoS agent couples to an all-IP network. As taught by Arunachalam, QoS is used to perform traffic flow control, for example as set forth at column 4, lines 16-59. This contrasts with the service primitive information, as recited Claim 1 of the present invention, which is used to set a function such as channel assignment information, handoff support, etc. The service primitive information includes the type of call and available radio channels according to service classes as defined at least on page 9 of the present application.

As an additional contrast to that which is taught by Arunachalam, Claim 1 includes the recitation of assigning a predetermined forward channel and a predetermined

reverse channel to the at least one mobile terminal, the predetermined forward channel and the predetermined reverse channel corresponding to the determined service primitive combination, and providing the at least one mobile terminal with the packet call service by using the assigned forward channel and assigned reverse channel, which is neither taught nor suggested by Arunachalam. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

In light of the discussion above, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1, overcomes the stated rejection. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-10, it is respectfully submitted that these claims also overcome the rejection by virtue of their dependence on Claim 1. Claims 1-18 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact

Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG/ml